

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/518,983	Applicant(s) R. Jean
	Examiner Gregory J. Strimbu	Group Art Unit 3634

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory J. Strimbu (PTO)

(3) _____

(2) Rudolf O. Siegesmund

(4) _____

Date of Interview Aug 22, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 9, 11, and 12

Identification of prior art discussed:

None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Suggested changes to more accurately define the applicant's invention and to overcome 35 USC 112 informalities. See the examiner's amendment for the changes made.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of interview requirements on reverse side or on attached



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.